



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/571,886

03/13/2006

Donald Robert Langdon

2003CH201

2678

25255

7590

01/27/2009

CLARIANT CORPORATION  
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT  
4000 MONROE ROAD  
CHARLOTTE, NC 28205

EXAMINER

TAYLOR II, JAMES W

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1796

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

01/27/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/571,886	<b>Applicant(s)</b> LANGDON ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> James W. Taylor II	<b>Art Unit</b> 1796	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 October 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 and 8-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 and 8-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. All outstanding claim rejections not explicitly maintained below are withdrawn in light of Applicant's amendment filed on 10/2/2008.
2. Text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior office action.
3. The new grounds of rejection set forth below are necessitated by Applicant's amendment filed on 10/2/2008. In particular, claim 1 has been amended to require that the metal sulfide is present in the material at a loading of 0.05 to 3 wt. % and that the binder is selected from a Markush group of binders. Contrary on the applicant's statement on page 4 of the amendment filed 10/2/2008, amended claim 1 contains not only the subject matter of canceled claim 7 but, in addition, contains a limitation imported from claims 9 with respect to the amount of metal sulfide. This combination has not previously been presented. Thus, the following action is properly made final.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. Claims 1-6 and 8-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hartman *et alli* (US 6,019,833).
5. Hartman teaches light colored conductive coating and associated processes (ti.). The binder for the composition is a saturated resin resin having pendent hydroxyl groups and an aminoplast curing agent, such as polyesters, polyurethanes, and ethylenically unsaturated monomers (c. 1, l. 65 to c. 2, l. 9). The composition further

Art Unit: 1796

comprises a light colored pigment that can be a mixture of multiple colored pigments (c. 2, ll. 38-45), which advantageously comprises a white and light colored pigment (c. 2, ll. 40-45). The light colored pigment can be *inter alia* zinc sulfide (c. 2, ll. 28-37). Other coloring pigments can be used, such as phthalocyanine blue or phthalocyanine green or metallic effect pigments, such as metal oxide encapsulated micas (c. 5, ll. 21 to 38).

6. Hartman fails to teach using 0.5 to 3.0 wt. % metal sulfide. Although Hartman teaches using 20 to 70 wt. % total light pigment (i.e., zinc sulfide and the white component), the reference is silent with respect to the ratio of zinc sulfide to white component. Further, one of ordinary skill in the art would have motivation to use less light colored pigment to change the aesthetic appearance of the final product (i.e., whiter with less color saturation). As such, ratio of zinc sulfide to white component is a result effective variable. Optimization of result effective variables through routine experimentation is not a patentable distinction. See *In re Beosch*, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980) and MPEP 2144.05 (II) (B). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to optimize the amount of zinc sulfide present in Hartman's invention to create a desired color.

7. Regarding claim 1, given that the above modification suggests creating similar composition to the present claims, the modification would innately be able to undergo laser marking.

8. Regarding claim 2, as noted above, the mica disclosed in Hartman is a metal-oxide encapsulated mica.

Art Unit: 1796

9. Regarding claim 3, the term "metal" refers to several elements from the s-block (except hydrogen), d-block, f-block, and the some of the s-block of the periodic table. Further, the three claimed metal oxides (i.e., antimony-, titanium-, and tin oxide) are all derived from known metal oxides. As such, one of ordinary skill in the art would understand that these three metal oxides are all established in the exclusive list of "metal oxides" disclosed in the prior art. See MPEP 2144.08 to species/genus relationships and MPEP 2144.09 for homolog/analog relationships. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to select antimony-, titanium-, and/or tin oxide as the metal oxide of Hartman.

10. Regarding claims 4-5, as noted above, the metal sulfide is zinc sulfide.

11. Regarding claims 6, 9, and 11, said other colored pigments (i.e., phthalocyanine blue, phthalocyanine green, and metal oxide coated mica) are cumulatively 0.5 to 25 wt. % of the composition. As such, there is an overlap in scope between the prior art and the instant claims. The claimed range would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, since it has been held that claiming an over lapping portion of the range taught in the prior is a *prima facie* case of obviousness. See *In re Malagari*, 182 USPQ 549 and MPEP 2144.05 (I). Further, one of ordinary skill in the art would understand that the loadings of these other colored pigments would, like the zinc sulfide above, directly control the resulting hue, saturation, and special effects in the case of metal oxide coated mica. As such, their concentrations are result effective variables. Optimization of result effective variables through routine experimentation is not a patentable distinction. See *In re Beosch*, 617

Art Unit: 1796

F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980) and MPEP 2144.05 (II) (B). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to optimize the amount of said other colored pigments present in Hartman's invention, including metal oxide coated mica, phthalocyanine blue, and phthalocyanine green, to create a desired color.

12. Regarding claim 8, the courts have stated that a chemical composition and its properties are inseparable. Therefore, if the prior art teaches the identical or substantially identical chemical structure and/or composition, the physical properties Applicant discloses and/or claims are necessarily present. See *In re Spada*, 911 F.2d 705, 15 USPQ2d 1655, (Fed. Cir. 1990). "Where the claimed and prior art products are identical or substantially identical in structure or composition, or are produced by identical or substantially identical processes, a *prima facie* case of either anticipation or obviousness has been established." *In re Best*, 562 F.2d 1252, 195 USPQ 430, (CCPA 1977). Further, if it is the applicant's position that this would not be the case, factual evidence would need to be provided to support the applicant's position.

### ***Response to Arguments***

13. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-6 and 8-11 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

14. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

15. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

16. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James W. Taylor II whose telephone number is (571) 270-5457. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30 am to 5:00 pm (off every other Friday).

17. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vasu Jagannathan can be reached on (571) 272-1119. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1796

18. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/James W Taylor II/  
Examiner, Art Unit 1796

jwt2

/Vasu Jagannathan/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1796